## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

GROV	/FR	Н	DAY	JIS
ono	۷ L:IX	11.	$D \cap V$	νıσ.

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 1:08-CV-16

v.

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

ST. JOSEPH COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES and THREE RIVERS POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants.	

## ORDER AND JUDGMENT APPROVING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Brenneman's Report and Recommendation in this matter (docket # 21) and Plaintiff Davis's Objections to the Report and Recommendation (docket # 22).

Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, where, as here, a party has objected to portions of a Report and Recommendation, "[t]he district judge . . . has a duty to reject the magistrate judge's recommendation unless, on de novo reconsideration, he or she finds it justified." 12 WRIGHT, MILLER, & MARCUS, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3070.2, at 381 (2d ed. 1997). Specifically, the Rules provide that:

The district judge to whom the case is assigned shall make a de novo determination upon the record, or after additional evidence, of any portion of the magistrate judge's disposition to which specific written objection has been made in accordance with this rule. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended decision, receive further evidence, or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

FED R. CIV. P. 72(b). De novo review in these circumstances requires at least a review of the evidence before the Magistrate Judge. *Hill v. Duriron Co.*, 656 F.2d 1208, 1215 (6th Cir. 1981).

The Court has reviewed de novo the claims and evidence presented to the Magistrate Judge;

the Report and Recommendation itself; and Plaintiff's objections. After its review, the Court finds

that Magistrate Judge Brenneman's Report and Recommendation is factually sound and legally

correct.

Mr. Davis does not raise specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, or

challenge in any specific way the analysis of the Report and Recommendation. The failure to lodge

specific objections is sufficient basis, standing alone, for this Court to adopt the Magistrate Judge's

Report and Recommendation. See Cowherd v. Million, 380 F.3d 909, 912 (6th Cir. 2004)

("Generally, the failure to file specific objections to a magistrate's report constitutes a waiver of

those objections."). Moreover, in this case the Magistrate Judge's analysis accurately states and

applies the law. There is no basis on the record for a § 1983 claim against Defendant, St. Joseph

County Department of Human Services, a division of the State of Michigan, or the Three Rivers

Police Department.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the

Magistrate Judge (docket # 21) is approved and adopted as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the St. Joseph County Department of Human Services'

Motion to Dismiss (docket # 13) is **GRANTED**;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Three Rivers Police Department's Motion for

Judgment on the Pleadings (docket # 16) is **GRANTED**;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED.

Dated: March 19, 2009

/s/ Robert J. Jonker

ROBERT J. JONKER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2